

— A —

SPEECH

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE

CLEVELAND AND HENDRICKS CLUB,

OCTOBER, 1884,

AT

SCARSDALE, WESTCHESTER CO., N. Y.,

BY

RICHARD LATHERS, OF NEW ROCHELLE,

Showing that the present paralysis in business and the distress of labor are the results of extravagant taxation, and an absurd application of *protection*, by which the *labor and enterprise* of the country are taxed rather than the *realized capital*. The manufacturer not only finds his *protection* neutralized by heavy duties on raw material, but his products are excluded from the markets of the world as our ships are from its carrying trade—by over taxation.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST, AND DEDICATED

TO

HON. WILSON G. HUNT.

Whose public spirit and sound Democracy are as distinguished as his personal integrity.

"An honest man—the noblest work of God."—POPE.

GANSEVOORT - LANSING
COLLECTION



— A —

SPEECH

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE

CLEVELAND AND HENDRICKS CLUB,

OCTOBER, 1884,

AT

SCARSDALE, WESTCHESTER CO., N. Y.,

BY

RICHARD LATHERS, OF NEW ROCHELLE,

Showing that the present paralysis in business and the distress of labor are the results of extravagant taxation, and an absurd application of *protection*, by which the *labor and enterprise* of the country are taxed rather than the *realized* capital. The manufacturer not only finds his *protection* neutralized by heavy duties on raw material, but his products are excluded from the markets of the world as our ships are from its carrying trade—by over taxation.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST, AND DEDICATED

TO

HON. WILSON G. HUNT,

Whose public spirit and sound Democracy are as distinguished as his personal integrity.

"An honest man—the noblest work of God."—POPE.



THEO. R. LOCKWOOD,
STATIONER AND PRINTER,
30 Cedar Street,
New York.



329.01
2345

Mr. President and Fellow Democrats of Scarsdale :

Thirty-six years ago this month, I made my first speech in a Democratic Convention at White Plains, and I have co-operated with the party steadily ever since in the promulgation and support of its constitutional principles and its candidates.

During that long period of political vicissitudes in nine Presidential elections, I am proud that Westchester has never failed to sustain our party principles as promulgated by Jefferson and enforced by Jackson, by casting a decided majority vote for every candidate who received a Democratic nomination for County, State or Federal office. I now desire to congratulate you on the high character for capacity and integrity of our present nominees for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, Grover Cleveland and Thomas A. Hendricks, they have been enthusiastically nominated not only by a Democratic Convention of the most distinguished men of our party, but seconded by the most prominent and respectable portion of the Republican party, and I have confidence will receive your zealous support.

I refrain from dilating on the high personal character and valuable public services of Grover Cleveland to the State, because the admirable speech of General Johnson, our able representative to the Legislature, to which we all have just listened with such interest and pleasure, and to which I could add nothing, ought to satisfy every voter of the ability and fitness of our candidate for the higher position to which we propose to elect him.

The candidate for the second place on the ticket, Thomas A. Hendricks, with whom I have had a long acquaintance, is a statesman of the very first rank in any country; he has filled the Gubernatorial office in his own

Calver + Ind Ref 21 Aug 47 aldine

State and the Senatorial office in Washington, and he was elected, as you know, Vice-President of the United States in 1876, but cheated out of his merited honor by Republican chicanery, is well and favorably known as a gentleman of the highest capacity, and a distinguished example of official honor and fidelity.

Our party loyalty is not only seconded in the present canvass by candidates of the highest personal reputation and sound principles of Democracy, but as I have said, we are further sustained by the better portion of the intelligent element of the Republican party; and its most influential press heartily joining us in rebuking the Republican machine nominations. The candidate of the Republican party seems to embody a cross of self-convicted corruption and a measure of rare audacity in assuming suffrage to be purchasable, and the honest sentiment of his own party to be defied and insulted thereby.

The sober second thought of the people which is the safety valve of our institutions, has at last come to the rescue. All thoughtful men of every shade of political opinion perceive the necessity of a reform by a change of an administration which has not only impoverished the country by war taxes in time of peace, with which to enrich speculative and corrupt officials, but has also initiated a ring domination supported by executive patronage regardless of the dictates of common official honesty, and culminating in the nomination of a candidate for the Presidency, who is convicted by his own (Mulligan) letters of corruption and mendacity, and this, too, while filling the distinguished office of Speaker of the House of Representatives, and as a Senator of the United States.

He is a ready debater, and well skilled in apology and defense, accomplishments which his official conduct has kept in practice. He possesses all the magnetism which a demagogue requires, but I deny that he has developed in his long public career a single element of statesmanship, he has never originated a single measure in or out of Congress, or written or uttered a single sentence evidencing the knowledge, culture or moral tone hitherto re-

quired for the Chief Magistracy of our great nation. On the contrary, his speeches in Congress have been marked by the lowest flippancy of party and sectional hate, and in coarse appeals to sectional and party prejudice varied only when engaged in "*casting an anchor to the windward*" or in offering to "*make himself useful*" (I quote his own words) where public plunder was to be secured, as is shown by his confidential letters to his friend Fisher.

He is, in the worse sense, all things to all men. A Puritan, while a New England editor advocating know nothingism to deprive the Irish Catholic of the right of suffrage. In New York he now poses as a Catholic with dynamite sympathies against England.

But he is always consistent as he informs us in "*seeing many ways in which he can be useful*" to forward schemes of public plunder in his own interest, and he stated a great truth when he again informed his friend Fisher, that *he would not be a deadhead* if permitted to take an interest in the corrupt schemes before Congress to which the Mulligan letters referred.

Eight years ago the leading organ of his own party, the *Chicago Tribune*, formulates its opinion of this candidate, it is the word painting of truth, and I adopt the formula because time has only emphasized it.

"A man who had voted for, or failed to oppose every subsidy of either land or money asked for while in Congress; known as a lobbyist before he entered Congress seeking contracts for arms. While in Congress and while Speaker the inside friend of the wildest corporations, ruling as Speaker to secure their bills, and claiming reward for his official action. Engaged in selling worthless bonds of these corporations and receiving large gratuities therefor. When pecuniarily involved, getting the Pacific Railroad to give him \$64,000 for what was not worth so many cents. * * * Is this the man to raise the standard of political morality."

But we are told that Blaine is a mighty man of progress. The Plumed Knight of political leaders. Yes, but he is also the *tattooed* leader of corrupt officials. Naaman also,

truth
partisan
dates to
of all shades

we are told, was a mighty man of valour, but he was a leper, and required the invocation of Elisha and to be seven times immersed in Jordan to cleanse and restore him to usefulness. But the cronic leprosy which afflicts the mighty candidate of the Republican party will require more than the invocations of Mr. Phelps and the golden stream of Jay Gould to restore the tattooed Knight to the confidence of the people or prevent the Gehazi of his party from spreading the loathsome disease engendered by public plunder.

The Republican party originating in sentiment, whether wise or unwise, was led by men of honest, earnest convictions into practical issues, which precipitated a civil war, out of which the emancipation of slavery was effected, guided by the honest administration of Lincoln, Seward, Chase and Sumner. With the restoration of peace and the return of the seceding States to the Union, the Republican party had fulfilled its purposed mission. It would have been well for the prosperity of our country, and the preservation of the popular record of that party, had it then terminated its existence.

The history of all parties shows that when the object of their creation is accomplished a continuation in the exercise of power too often originates schemes of plunder in which corrupt leaders come into power, and honest men are disregarded and retire or are forced out of the party counsels.

It is the first time in the history of our political contests that we are so humiliated as to be called upon to rebuke official corruption in a candidate for the Chief Magistracy, convicted as he is by proofs over his own signature and the charges produced by distinguished members of his party, who refuse to support him because wanting the best elements of common honesty, and because thereby, while administering an official issue, therefore, is not strictly a fit one of the fitness of the candidate for high trust. In this issue citizens have a vital interest, and the earnest

support of the Democratic candidate by our best citizens, irrespective of party, shows that the public mind is aroused. Corruption in official life is to be rebuked at the coming election, and a capable and honest discharge of executive duties is held to be essential qualifications to fill the place adorned by Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln.

The fact is Blaine has risen to be the head of a class of Congressional corruptionists, the father and promotor of schemes of public plunder. The intelligent and honest of his own party wish, by killing him off as a public man, to exterminate the race of lobby plunderers.

A planter once troubled by thieving rabbits in his pea patch, sent his gardener to kill them off. Pompey, seeing a jackass in the enclosure, whose long ears and fondness for peas attracted his observation, ran to his master and said he had seen the father of all the rabbits, and would save time by shooting him.

We are not here to-night to investigate the truth or falsity of the social and obscene scandals urged against both of these candidates for the Presidency.

The charges, if true in either case, are, no doubt, exaggerated by partisan zeal to serve partisan purposes, rather than to conserve public morals or protect social virtue. If they are guilty of the unchastity charged, let them respond to a competent social or legal investigation, and punished as other criminals are by the penalties of fine, imprisonment or social ostracism. No one should justify crimes which strike at the very foundations of civilizd society. But we cannot permit an important and, perhaps, vital political contest and coupled with an investigation into alleged *political* crimes to be relaxed, overlooked or diverted by unsupported social scandals against political candidates of either party which partisan ingenuity has brought forward to draw attention from *political* issues of practical importance to the whole country.

If these gentlemen were candidates for the priesthood or teachers in seminaries of learning for training the youth of either sex, social purity and Christian piety would be

essentials. Unfortunately public men are not always as pious or as chaste as they should be, rarely endowed with such measure of virtue as to fit them for the priesthood or the church, nor is the priesthood, though pious and chaste, the best qualified to discharge the practical duties of statesmen, the reign of the saints in England in times which produced Cromwell and Praise God Bare Bones, proving this. Perhaps it is to be regretted that distinguished men of all ages, even running back to Biblical times, furnish so few examples of the chastity of Joseph.

Even David, a man after God's own heart, whose pious fervor inspires our faith as we read his Psalms, failed when tempted by the fascinating person of Uriah's wife; And his son Solomon, the beloved of the Lord, by his irregular love compassed 700 wives and 300 concubines. Human nature, we are constrained to confess, presents that mixed composition by which sweet and bitter, pure and muddy waters emanate from the same fountain. The same David who so wronged Uriah, affords us in his Psalms the best sources of pious inspiration, while his administration of government was wise and patriotic. The same Solomon whose variety of amours shocks all social and moral propriety, affords us in his Ecclesiastes and Proverbs the highest sources of wisdom and the clearest tenets of morality, for we are informed by the divine writer that God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, for he was wiser than all men, and possessed a largeness of heart even as the sand is on the seashore. The student of history finds that among the most distinguished statesmen, philosophers, artists and sometimes even divines of usefulness and piety that their talents and many virtues have been obscured by this infirmity. It would seem that men adapted by genius and culture for the profession and practical duties of public life are, unfortunately, too often subjected to the most lively passions, which, like weeds, flourish best in a fertile soil. The fascinations of the lovely sex, to which perhaps their distinguished talents and position brings them within temptation and bright and cultivated women always gravitate to great men, is perhaps to

be considered in mitigation of this weakness. Thus the wisdom and power of Solomon attracted the admiration and induced a visit from the Queen of Sheba, subjecting him to the blandishments of her own great beauty and accomplishments.

Demosthenes, Pericles, Socrates, Julius Caesar, Henry the Fourth of France, Cardinal Richelieu, William the Third of England, Frederick the Great, Washington, Franklin, Hamilton and Webster are among those that have not escaped the scandal of this vice.

As the origin of sin has been found to be an unprofitable investigation, so too we cannot explain the reason for this propensity as we cannot justify the existence of this passion so cronic in our race, coupled as it often is with piety, wisdom, patriotism and bravery, as illustrated in the lives of these distinguished men.

Indeed it is quite puerile and ridiculous to look for perfection in public men. Wellington could conquer Napoleon, but was unfit to direct the civil affairs of England under a reform demanded by the people. General Grant, the hero of our civil war, initiated, while President, the most corrupt Federal administration we have ever had. And his bankrupt banking firm of Grant and Ward, will long be notorious for the most gigantic fraud of the century, owing, it is said, \$17,000,000, without sufficient assets to disburse the cost of litigation, which their fraudulent complications render necessary.

Therefore, while we must denounce all vice, we cannot conceal from ourselves the necessity of utilizing virtues and qualifications adapted for the purposes of practical life, even when coupled with grave weaknesses and immoral qualities in the same individual. We cannot, therefore, in politics look so much for the virtue of chastity as for official integrity.

We want for official trusts the civic virtues of Washington rather than the chastity of Joseph. We despair of finding candidates who live up to the whole Decalogue, but we must require them to respect the Eighth and Ninth Commandments, and neither steal nor bear false

witness. We therefore are disposed to forgive Blaine if guilty of disregarding the Seventh Commandment, but we hold him responsible for a gross violation of the Eighth and Ninth, of which his letters convict him. Now let this scandal rest with its contemptible promoters.

In this attempt to blemish the fair fame of Governor Cleveland, there is one conclusive answer to the unsupported charge of an obscure, vulgar man, who disgraces the ministry, circulated as it is by a corrupt faction of political opponents; and that is the esteem he enjoys of the clergy and laity and the most reputable element of social and political life at home. He has been elected Mayor of his own city, having the united suffrage of both parties, and subsequently enjoying the same endorsement, elected Governor of the State, by the largest majority ever given to any candidate for that office. And still further, with the same support, he comes before us as the reform Presidential candidate, in which the most distinguished Republicans and their most influential press are with us heartily to defeat a disreputable candidate of their own party.

Failing by this scandal to cover up and draw attention from the official corruptions of Blaine as proved by the Mulligan letters, they now falsely charge the Democratic party with *free trade* as opposed to the *protection of labor* so as to mislead the more ignorant class of voters.

If you will read the Democratic platform you will perceive that there is not a single clause which can be tortured into opposition to the protection of labor or any desire to advocate absolute *free trade*. On the contrary, we desire to protect American labor from the evils of fostering, by legislation, speculative monopolies and unprofitable enterprises which increase the enormous taxation that now bears so heavily on our laboring population, and has led to the general corruption of official life. After twenty-three years of this miscalled protection to favor our manufacturers, in the midst of teeming harvests, profound peace at home and abroad, and an aggregation of capital in the hands of the wealthy, without example in

our history; we have perhaps one million of factory and mining operators out of employment or working short time, while these heavily protected corporations are going into bankruptcy, shutting up their mills or reducing wages, because ruined by an extravagant protection, which defeats its purpose. Whether free trade or protection would best serve the public interest is not now open for discussion, because no practical legislation can at present be introduced while we need so large a revenue to disburse our national debt and pension list. The Democratic party now simply desires to modify the tariff and reduce general taxation. It may be that there is a kind of vested right in maintaining for a limited time the policy of protection in *justice to capital* invested in manufacturing, but it is a fallacy to urge the policy as in the *interest of labor*.

The statistics of our protected manufacturers show that twenty per cent. is the largest average portion of their products which has ever been paid as wages to labor. Why, then, is it necessary to have sixty to ninety per cent. duty to protect them against what is called foreign labor? The excess for that purpose is here plainly manifest, and hence the necessity of tariff reform in the interest of the consumer and, as I shall show, even in the interest of the labor and capital sought to be protected. It will be found, too, on investigation that while wages may be at first temporarily increased by the effect of a high protective tariff, yet the cost of living is increased also in greater ratio, because general prices advance as rapidly as wages, so as to leave the laborer with less means for support than he had enjoyed under a moderate tariff and under moderate prices.

It is just as impossible for a tariff on articles of general consumption to raise wages without a corresponding advance in the cost of living, as it would be for a man to lift himself up from the ground by straining at the waistband of his trousers to overcome the law of gravitation. The laws of trade cannot be ignored successfully by legislation.

Personally I earnestly desire the success of our manufacturing enterprises. My only son, after leaving college, entered a New England woolen factory, and gave four years of his time, working as a common operative, without compensation, to acquire a practical knowledge of the business of his choice. And now, as one of the proprietors of a small factory, in common with so many in Massachusetts, is a victim of overprotection, and the loss of an export demand for his goods, made in excess of the home demand because of the high cost of our protected wool and the tariff on raw materials generally, as I propose to show.

In 1860, under a moderate Democratic tariff, we produced nearly 2,000 millions dollars of manufactured articles and paid to workmen as wages twenty per cent. of the same. In 1880, under a high protective Republican tariff, we produced over 5,000 millions, but labor only received sixteen per cent. of the result, because the tariff on the raw material had been so increased as to draw too heavily on the portion formally conceded to wages. And it is just here that the evil is most obvious. The protection of a high tariff to favor American labor as against foreign imports is more than neutralized by the increased price of the raw material and greater cost of living by reason of the high duty levied on it; and the tendency in such cases is to lower wages to meet the advance in the cost of materials.

Let me illustrate this in a homely but, I trust, a clear manner. A bootmaker produces a pair of boots for \$5.00, the imported or protected material costing \$3.00; this leaves for his labor just \$2.00. But when Congress increases the tariff \$1.00 on the leather, which of course increases the price of the material in the boots to \$4.00, this advance compels the bootmaker to ask \$6.00 for his boots, an increase to which his customer demurs. To meet him and effect the sale, the tendency is a reduction of his own wages. Certainly the bootmaker has a little chance to advance his compensation in the face of an advance on the tariff on leather.

But suppose Congress to be wise enough to modify the tariff and thus reduce the price of the leather to \$2.00 for the material in the boots, which would enable the maker to increase his wages, perhaps, to \$2.50, and yet rejoice his customers by a reduction to \$4.50 on boots, which would have cost perhaps \$6.00 under the high tariff, and \$5.00 if the bootmaker had been compelled to concede half the value of his labor to meet the increased cost of the leather under a *protective tariff*.

Thus it is that an extravagant duty on raw material falls heavily on the laborer engaged in manufacturing it, and still more on him as a consumer of everything so taxed, and when we reflect that ninety out of every hundred of our people are consumers who obtain no government protection, and our farmers especially, who pay an average of forty to fifty per cent. on all they consume, and yet are compelled to sell their grain at exactly what it will bring in England, minus the cost of transporting it there, certainly the tariff does not increase the price of grain. Grain, now suffering under our present high tariff, the price being lower than ever known in the history of that production. It seems marvellous that the glaring evils of the present tariff have not long since been modified to meet the stern requirements of an overtaxed people, and to relieve the manufacturer on his raw material. A reduction of duty on raw material not only enables the manufacturer to pay more for labor, but enables him to extend his business and compete in the markets of the world, affording employment for an increased number of operatives, and this demand for labor would increase wages.

When we reflect that the average wages in the products of our manufactories does not exceed twenty per cent. of the selling price of the manufactured articles, while there is an average duty of over fifty per cent. to seventy-five per cent. on the raw material, we can easily perceive that even a reduction of one-half of the enormous tariff would not only tend to cheapen the articles to the consumers, but leave also a large margin for the increase of wages to

be paid for labor, and a margin for profit to the manufacturer. It is a suggestive fact, in proof of the evils of overprotecting raw material, that in all cases where labor is the chief ingredient in any American product that is the one which successfully competes in the markets of the world; such as Waltham watches, sewing machines and agricultural implements; whereas, in products that involve but little cost of labor as compared with the cost of the raw material, such as wool and iron products are not only shut out of foreign markets altogether, but produced at such cost as to circumscribe the home demand.

Perhaps the woolen manufacturers suffer most by this impolitic and unjust tax on the productive industry of the country, as it virtually shuts out cheap foreign wools, and enhances the price of domestic wool. But while this is recognized as the chief cause of the present depression in their trade, and the consequent reduction of wages in that industry, the manufacturers of the East submit to the consequences of their own combination with the wool growers of the West, which by their influence on members of Congress, and the usual log rolling in Congress, procured the enactments of a high tariff to protect the Western wool growers, and a still higher tariff to recoup and protect the Eastern manufacturer. The combination of these two taxes added to the cost of labor renders the product of our looms so dear as to check consumption at home and preclude exportation to relieve our own overstocked market. This is called by our Republican orators *protection of American industry*—in the face of reduced wages and unemployed labor, and they have the assurance to wish us to support the policy.

The copper, coal and mining interests are protected by combinations in the same manner to the destruction of many enterprises of manufacturing industry. We are told that competition by these protected monopolies will reduce the cost of the raw material, but this they avoid by the *pooling system*, by which coal, copper and iron are sold at prices fixed by agreement by themselves, which even limits the quantity produced so as to enhance the price by

scarcity. How is it possible in view of these practices, for other manufacturers to succeed? Hence the loss of our shipbuilding, formerly the pride of our mechanics, and the nursery of our navy.

This policy intended to enrich the mining monopolist certainly does not tend to enhance wages, or build up manufacturing, but it does make the cost of living extravagant to the consumer. The laws of trade, however, are as inexorable as the laws of gravitation. Special privileges and monopolies in the long run defeat themselves. It is extremely doubtful whether the capital invested in these favored enterprises the past twenty years, have afforded as safe and profitable remuneration as investments have been in enterprises independent of government support, and I think I could show that our manufactures increased in greater ratio as compared with the population and the capital of the country before than since the protective system was adopted, and that capital formerly invested was more safe and more productive, and that wages relatively to cost of living ruled higher than has obtained since.

We speak of this paralysis in business as if caused by over production, but we should not deceive ourselves, the cause is clearly over taxation, and instead of our manufacturers resorting to a reduction of the wages of the operative—they should apply to Congress to reduce the duty on raw materials, and thus protect the interest of American labor. We should always keep before us that government has only what it *takes* from the people in taxes; therefore, so-called protection at best, is a mode of aiding one industry by taxing the means of another. It really robs Peter to assist Paul, and when the plan operates to Paul's damage—as the present depression of manufacturing shows, it is certainly wise to investigate the source of evil and apply the remedy—and hence, we who are overtaxed by this false system of protection which proves so disastrous to all interests, desire not Free Trade, but judicious measures of reform.

The fact is, there is a higher law than legislative enactments, which controls the wages of labor—like capital, its compensation is mainly ruled by demand and supply.

Times of plenty and successful enterprise unobstructed by high taxes, increase the demand for commodities, and a greater demand for labor to produce them, and as labor cannot suddenly increase in the same ratio, higher compensation will follow the active demand. Commerce, we know, increases this demand, and should be encouraged. Demagogues may mislead the people with their cry of legislative protection to enhance wages, but they cannot destroy the force of experience of ages, which proves that a heavily taxed people must accept a lower range of wages.

The wages of labor in Germany enjoying heavy protective duties, is about at starvation point, while Free Trade England compensates its labor with liberal wages, next to the wages paid to our own citizens. Indeed, skilled labor in England is so well compensated since the adoption of Free Trade, that we get little emigration from that country. England is too wise to tax raw material and lose thereby the markets of the world. But advocates of a high protective tariff claim that this protective legislation benefits the *operative* by the advance of wages, and benefits the *unprotected consumers* by making a home market for his produce. The farmer, however, who now finds his wheat selling at the lowest price for which it has ever sold, cannot perceive this. Certainly a tariff does not enable a people to eat more grain or wear more clothes because of the increase of price, which protection makes inevitable, and the price in foreign markets for our grain is not maintained by our tariff on imports. The protectionists inform us that while laborers' wages under the moderate Democratic tariff of 1860, were but \$5 per week, that now they have reached \$6 $\frac{60}{100}$ a week under the Republican high tariff. Now, if we concede this glowing statement of a great advance, which seems very precarious in the face of about a million of operatives out of work, who would gladly be employed at a reduction of

wages, let us see if there is a real advance. Wages are high or low relatively to the cost of living. In 1860, five dollars would purchase forty-five pounds of fresh beef, while in 1884, six dollars and sixty cents will purchase but thirty-eight pounds.

In 1860, five dollars would purchase seventy-six pounds corned beef; in 1884, \$6.60 would purchase but sixty-four pounds. In 1860, five dollars would pay the rent of four rooms for the workman's family for thirty-seven days, while in 1884, six dollars and sixty cents would only procure the same accommodations for twenty-four days.

In 1860, five dollars would pay a workman's board for fourteen days, while in 1884, six dollars and sixty cents would only pay for ten days. The unprotected farmer on his flour and grain gives us the only cheap necessity which we consume. This is a fair example of the relative cost which living bears to wages in the periods named.

When one points to evidence all around us that the most protected interests are the greatest sufferers, and that bankruptcy throughout careful, intelligent and enterprising New England, as well as in the mining industries of the West are paralyzed; we are answered that this is caused by over production. This is a fallacy to cover up the real cause, *over taxation* which makes their manufactured production so dear as to check consumption at home, and utterly precludes exportation to relieve the over-taxed market of our over-taxed people. The nominal advance in wages during the civil war was not due to the protective tariff, but to the extraordinary demand for labor and material to supply the army at a time when nearly one million of workmen were drafted into the army, leaving workshops and manufactories with few operatives, and besides the nominal wages being paid in a depreciated currency worth at times less than sixty cents on the dollar, was quite inadequate to meet the greatly increased prices of food and clothing, then prevailing and not yet reduced.

There is now a great depression in manufactures of our own country, in France and in Germany, producing great

distress and much unemployed labor in these centres of the protective policy.

Free Trade England on the contrary, where the raw material is never taxed, although feeling through sympathetic effect, which a general dullness in the trade of these great nations always produces, has not as yet reduced the wages or resorted to short time, and while we are overwhelmed by numerous and extensive failures these disasters are quite limited in England.

Such is the effect of the wise policy which refrains from taxing raw material, and encourages commerce.

In our own country we have the evils of the tariff, but we have also political corruption which is simply producing a crop of State repudiation, corporation frauds, official defalcations and bank failures. Railroads prematurely built by corrupt government patronage, and manufactures stimulated by unwise government protection, are now paying the severe penalty which competition inflicts on over production at home, when shut out of a foreign outlet for our surplus.

Whatever advantage might be claimed for a tariff for protection to our manufacturers is neutralized by the tax on raw material. Speculation, like a fever has exhausted the resources of our business men; the active capital of the country is depleted by losses which this speculative mania has produced. Industry has been despised and modest enterprises abandoned for speculation in worthless securities and hopeless schemes for speedy wealth absorb public attention; protection to manufacturers, and corrupt legislative aid to premature railroad schemes have been the stock in trade of the Republican party and is now their only argument for a continuance of power. You have observed lately how frequently the operatives in factories have had their wages reduced, or the mills shutting down, leaving them without employment because the protected raw material is so dear as to leave the manufacturer without profit, unless he can enforce a reduction of wages.

Would it not be a wiser remedy to have a reduction on the duties on the raw materials and on the articles on which labor subsists ? This certainly is a better *protection* to labor than a reduction of wages.

For instance, if the tariff on wool was reduced to twenty per cent. wages could actually be advanced, but the high tariff advocates prefer to have the wages reduced rather than a modification of their pet scheme. This I quite understand ; but I cannot understand the stupidity of the person who believes that protection on the raw material tends to increase wages or that American manufacturing industry is benefitted by the high cost of living.

Sometimes necessity comes to the aid of justice and reforms are effected which years of reason could not effect. The Corn laws of England were sustained till the high prices of food menaced the government with civil wars. We in this country now suffer by the exorbitant prices of clothing and other necessities of life. An exhausting and unequal system of taxation because falling chiefly on the subsistence of labor and very little on the capital of the wealthy.

We are now the largest manufacturing nation in the world, even exceeding the production of Great Britain ; and yet to our shame we export but two per cent. of the products of the industry of a country which over seventy years ago took for its battle-cry "*Free Trade and Sailors' Rights*," in defense of which our gallant naval hero Lawrence sacrificed his life, exclaiming : "Don't give up the ship."

Even the bunting, the fabric of our flag, which typifies the unity and power of our country, and which inspires the patriotism of every American in war and fills him with pride in times of peace, is taxed twenty-three cents a pound, equal to 120 per cent. duty on the foreign cost to sustain a protective monopoly of General Butler, a demagogue now posing as a candidate for the Presidency as the workingman's friend, but really a stool pigeon for Blaine.

The New York Sun's opinion of B. F. Butler on June 26, 1873, thus formulates his qualifications :

"This bad man, with his crooked ways, foul methods, distorted mind and wicked heart, glories in these moral deformities, flaunts them before the public eye and trifles with them as political merchandise * * * making politics a trade * * * despotic when clothed with power * * * cowardly by nature, mercenary from habit, destitute of a single ennobling quality, * * * he is to-day the leading candidate for the highest honor in enlightened and moral Massachusetts."

Surely no Democrat can be so debased as to vote for such a candidate. I therefore dismiss him to merited obscurity, where the November election will consign him.

The Democratic party is not a free trade party intending to abolish the tariff on imports or desiring to cripple the manufacturing industry of our country.

We are all proud of the strides which the genius of our inventors and the enterprise and the skill of our artisans have developed in the growth and perfection of the great factories of our country, and would be unwilling to remove a single prop necessary to build up and sustain their prosperity.

Many of us are free traders in the sense of believing that our government was not instituted to current the channels of labor or direct the application of industry by legislative measures of protection, or any other advantage in favor of one class at the expense of another.

That while duties on foreign imports for government revenue may be the most feasible, as it appears to be the most popular mode of taxation, yet duties levied principally for protection on articles of general consumption is an unjust and impolitic abuse of the taxing power, because unjust and injurious to the many who consume, while in most cases failing to benefit the few intended to be favored.

But even vicious legislative measures of long established practice, which have induced capital and labor to embark in fostered enterprises should not be hastily discontinued. Like a cancer which afflicts the human body it must be treated with skillful reference to the constitution and

established habits, and even the prejudices of the patient. The effect of time and conservative measures of relief to alleviate pain and prevent the spread of the evil rather than the surgeon's knife, have been found the safer, and in most cases the surer, mode of ultimate cure. We want reform, not revolution. Conservative men therefore, and the counsels of the Democratic party, as indicated in the platform of party principles which Cleveland and Hendricks so heartily accept and endorse, propose to remedy the glaring defects of a system which, like a cronic disorder, cannot safely now be removed, but must be reformed in such a manner as to reduce, as far as practicable, the unequal taxes and mitigate the burdens now resting unequally on labor, which characterizes the present protective tariff. A reform by which our foreign commerce may be restored and afford our manufacturers access to the markets of the world by which to relieve the home market of surplus production. We must emancipate our trade from restrictions as destructive to commerce and manufactures, as the walls of China have been to that of the Celéstial Empire.

As a still further evidence of the need of reform of the tariff to afford real protection to American labor, I will only mention that while luxuries like champagne, laces, jewelry and the finer fabrics imported for the use of the rich are taxed but from 35 to 50 per cent., the duties levied on the necessities of life consumed by the workingman are higher, such as rice, 95 per cent.; spool cotton, 76 per cent.; castor oil, 136 per cent.; alpaca; and coarse blankets, 90 per cent.; while fine blankets but 40 per cent.; woolens and coarse dress goods generally 70 to 95 per cent.; sugar, 60 per cent. This discrimination against articles consumed by persons of moderate means is followed throughout; the finer and more expensive articles being subject to the lightest duties. This policy of protection certainly does not lean to the protection of the American laborer, whose expenses exhaust his income. And here I would impress on all who live by their personal exertions, by mental or manual labor, that the tariff on articles of general con-

sumption is a tax levied chiefly and oppressively on them. And in all cases, even under the most equitable tariff which can be levied on the consumption of the people, rather than by raising revenue from the accumulations of capital, becomes a tax on the laborer beyond his just contribution to the support of government; and as the fund devoted to wages is chiefly the product of the savings and accumulations of the enterprise and industry of the country, that portion taken by taxes out of circulation beyond the economical need of the government increases the evil because it tends to reduce the fund which otherwise would be used to employ labor and foster enterprises, which always increases wages. It will be found that wages are low and savings of labor deficient in all heavily taxed nations and in our own country since taxes have increased, especially those levied on articles of clothing and subsistence. It is rare that workingmen now accumulate, as formerly, savings against sickness and old age, while large speculative wealth enriches the few. The workingman, therefore, has the greatest interest in guarding against government extravagance, and should oppose special legislation for any class by which taxes are increased. There is already an alarming increase in speculative wealth in the country and a corresponding decrease of successful industry. The rich are certainly becoming richer and the poor more numerous.

This speculative mania tends to degrade honest labor. It is rare that you find a native apprentice in our workshops or engaged in the lower mercantile employments in our cities. The foreign born young men, not ashamed of manual labor, rise from these useful positions and become, as they deserve, rich and influential, while too many of our native young men are out of employment or vainly pursuing overstocked professions and clerical positions or the degrading pursuit of politics, which the use of money in our elections employs and deprave.

One of the most obvious fallacies of the protective theory is that which was intended to foster shipbuilding in New England. Under the Democratic policy of mod-

erate tariff there were built some four hundred first class ships annually. At present, under Republican protection, that industry does not produce annually one hundred ships ; and this deficiency in ships while our commerce has increased over three fold. Certainly ship carpenters, as a class, have not been benefitted by that form of protection.

It is well known that not over 20 per cent. of the cost of a ship consists of labor. It is admitted by master builders that the greater skill and industry of our mechanics more than recoups them for the higher wages that prevail here. Yet owing to the enormous duties levied on the materials necessary for the construction of a vessel we have nearly lost that industry and deprived our citizens of the advantage and profits of an occupation peculiar to Yankee genius ; hitherto fostered by Democratic measures, a source, too, of national pride in seeing the Stars and Stripes floating from the masts of our fine clipper ships in every part of the world, fostering a naval spirit, and competing with Great Britain for the sovereignty of the seas.

We have now lost the precedence in ship building, and in the carrying trade and our navy is simply contemptible, in numbers and utility falling below the sixth-rate maritime nations of Europe. We have not a single steamer crossing the Atlantic bearing the flag of our country.

Out of 3,000 cargoes of the products of our agriculture shipped from New York to foreign ports, less than one hundred cargoes were carried by our own tonnage, and we pay to foreign vessels for carrying our own products to market not less annually than one hundred millions of dollars. Under Democratic rule of moderate duties our ships carried not only three-quarters of our foreign commerce, but competed with Great Britain for a portion of her own. Now we carry but one-quarter of our own foreign commerce.

When one suggests these facts to a Republican protectionist he replies that the loss of the carrying trade is more than replaced by the great extension of our railroad

enterprises. This reminds one of the man who reproached his tailor for having cut the legs of his trousers too short. The flippant tailor replied: "But, my dear sir, have you contemplated my liberality in extending the tails of your coat?"

The fact is, one hardly knows which is the greater evil, the loss of our commercial supremacy on the ocean or the so-called gain of an over supply of railroads on the land on which millions of capital have been squandered and the public defrauded by speculative corporations. Now, corporations are essential for the aggregation of capital to undertake large enterprises, and while their rights and immunities should be scrupulously respected, we must guard against their rapacity and tyranny which monopolies tend to inflict on the country, and especially guard against their corruptive influences over our public men by which already they have acquired, without consideration, millions of acres of our public lands—a territory more than equal to the whole of New England, New York and Pennsylvania. And with these corruptly procured lands they have acquired also grants of millions of dollars and the use of the financial credit of the nation, which they have abused, and while heavily indebted to the government, refuse to pay from their earnings. This extravagant abuse of legislation in Congress, entailing perpetual taxation on the labor of the country, certainly requires reform as a proper measure of protecting American labor. The election of Grover Cleveland will open the books at Washington so that we shall know how many of the Republican leaders and to what amount they have individually profited by these schemes of corruption, including Credit Mobilier and Star Route frauds, which the Republican administration seem unwilling to investigate.

Mr. Blaine is now posing before our fellow citizens of Irish birth, soliciting their suffrage on the ground of some vague suggestion that his foreign policy, if elected, will in some way vindicate the wrongs of Ireland. I am quite confident that there is too much intelligence among that class of citizens to be moved by the arguments of a dema-

gogue who a few years ago was the earnest advocate of the Know-nothing party that proposed in the State of Maine to disfranchise Irishmen altogether, and not long since, in Congress, the equally earnest advocate of negro suffrage and the power of negro domination over the disfranchised whites in South Carolina.

As Secretary of State, under Garfield's administration, he permitted an adopted citizen of Irish birth to remain in a British prison without warrant of law till that government thought proper to discharge him, being only a suspected person without proof, Blaine refusing, after many applications, to afford that protection to which all citizens are entitled when improperly treated in a foreign country, and contrary to the Democratic example afforded him by Secretary of State Marcy, when called on by the Emperor of Austria to apologize because a captain in one of our frigates rescued an adopted citizen from an Austrian prison by threatening to fire on the town. The reply was that an adopted citizen must receive from our government the same support in foreign countries as a native, and this Democratic Secretary rewarded the officer for his gallantry by the presentation of a sword. These are the only two cases bearing on the rights of our adopted citizens in foreign countries that I can recall, and I leave to you to judge which party can be relied upon for the protection of their rights.

Much has been said of the capture of the Irish vote by the blandishments of Blaine's friends who would move their religious prejudices by claiming Catholic paternity for Blaine or some family relation of the kind, and that larch demagogue, Butler, who is merely Blaine's stoo pigeon, has the assurance also to class them together as *the Irish vote* as sheep or slaves are herded by their keepers. My own Irish blood revolts at this indignity to a race in every respect, origin, capacity, culture and loyalty, fulfilling their duties of citizenship in every relation from the lowest manual labor to the highest mental employment with usefulness and success.

It is true most of them come here in poverty to enjoy the blessings of equal rights, and to reap the benefit of their own labor, denied them by the hard conditions of English domination over their own conquered country. But they brought with them the capital which we desired, as the best elements of national prosperity and power, strong, brave hearts, patriotism, industry and sympathy for Democratic government. During the agitation of the native American party to organize a prejudice against their religion and their right to exercise the suffrage of freemen when New England Puritans burned their convents and insulted their priests, a stripling of this class assailed an Irishman who was active at the polls in advocacy of the Democratic party, "what right have you (says he) to interfere in our election, you have no stake in the community and brought nothing into the country?" Sure my young friend, replied the good natured Irishman, neither of us have much to boast of in that way. You came into this coutry naked; and, begorra, I brought only a red shirt and a pair of corduroy breeches.

You cannot name a single branch of civil or religious employment or any profession, judicial, military, scientific or literary in which Irishmen are not among the first in qualifications and zeal, keeping pace fully with the cultivation of every age and every country.

They enjoyed the use of letters and the light of Christianity as early as the fifth century, and their scholars flourished in the eighth and ninth century in every court in Europe. Even the barbarous attempts to prohibit education in Ireland by English despotism failed to suppress the natural genius of the race. Bishop Berkley, Dean Swift and Sterne in history, philosophy and theology; Steele, Sheridan, Goldsmith and Moore, essayists, wits and poets; Wellington, the hero of Waterloo; Burke, still ranking the first statesman and orator in the world; Grattan, Emmet, Curran and O'Connell, statesmen, lawyers, orators and patriots, all men of world-wide reputation, occur to me as representatives of the race in Great Britain; the O'Donnell's in Spain, and the McMahons in France; Chas.

Carroll, of Carrollton, and Edward Rutledge, of South Carolina, signers of our Declaration of Independence.

General Richard Montgomery, who commanded the Northern department of our patriot army in the Revolution, and who fell at the head of our New York troops in his attack on Quebec. Gov. Clinton, who opened up the trade of the West to the commerce of New York, by his project of the Erie canal. General Jackson, the hero of the battle of New Orleans, who as Democratic President, preserved the Union against nullification without resort to civil war, and destroyed the bank monopoly. Chief Justice Taney, the ornament of our Supreme Court; John C. Calhoun, the constitutional defender of State Rights and local self-government, and Chas. O'Connor, the distinguished jurist, come to my memory as showing the claim of Irish blood to national consideration and well calculated to inspire Irishmen with pride of race, and in raising them above the influence of the modern demagogues, who insult them by appealing to race or religious prejudice. Irishmen must never forget that here they are American citizens, and although I hope the time will never come in which their deepest sympathies and warmest support will not be heartily given to the emancipation of the home of their birth, and in conserving the comfort and support of those left behind them; yet, as citizens of this Republic, endowed with all its rights and privileges, they are subject to the duty of giving its interests the first consideration, unmoved by prejudices of religion in the support of candidates, or lured by the false promises of demagogues regarding the foreign policy of our country, which must respect the international law of non-interference, however much the Democracy may generously sympathize with the struggles of an oppressed people for the rights Irishmen enjoy here.

But this sympathy must not extend to any violation of our international responsibilities. We have just recovered some \$15,000,000 of an indemnity from England as a penalty because that government, during our civil war, permitted Confederate cruisers to be fitted out in her ports to

prey upon our commerce and destroy our shipping; and, surely, no respectable citizen will countenance private assassination or the destruction of property by dynamite expeditions into a nation with which we are at peace.

It appears to me that there is too much trifling with the sacred trust reposed in the voter, native as well as adopted. Why should the suffrage of freemen ever be influenced by prejudice, or be marketable at the polls? It is the palladium of a citizens' rights. It is the sole protection of the poor man against the rapacity of the rich and the influential.

I cannot find words sufficiently strong to express my contempt for the freeman who would sell his birthright for a mess of pottage, or to express my indignation towards the candidate, who so far forgets his dignity as to descend to the purchase of suffrage which ought to be a free tribute to his honesty and capacity.

It is openly charged that the Hon. L. P. Morton, purchased his appointment as Minister to Paris, by supplying money to corrupt the voters in Indiana in favor of Garfield, and he now leaves his post and returns here to use a corresponding effort to elect Blaine. This is a glaring and shameless prostitution of our diplomatic service. It tends not only to deprave our elections and lower the dignity of official life, but also to make posts of honor and of trust the prize of corrupt moneyed aspirants. Even the United States Senate is not an exception. This practice under Republican rule has removed from public life their men of ability and experience, who are too proud, too honest or too poor to seek public employment by corrupting their fellow-citizens. The use of money in elections is spreading. I regret to admit to the disgrace of both parties, that nominations even to inferior elective offices, as well as support at the polls, have their price. Congressional, legislative, judicial, and county candidates find election expenses largely beyond the nominal salaries. Of course, this deprives the public of the services of many of our most capable and honest men, and unless the corrupting practices can be reformed, official life will be a

disgrace, and we shall follow the Republic of Rome, in the sale of government itself. It is the bane of Republican government and the cause of the overthrow of constitutional liberty everywhere. Would that we had a statute which punished the sale or purchase of a vote by depriving the parties forever of a right which they had abused. In voting the citizen exercises a great personal privilege, and discharges a sacred public duty. Political parties like religious sects are the essential combinations of persons of like sympathy for religious or public utility. Party affiliations, therefore, should be limited to that object and must be disregarded by every thoughtful citizen when the public weal is confronted by men or measures prejudicial to the public interest.

The unpardonable sin, or the total depravity of theology, is supposed to be that state which utterly ignores virtue and approves of vice. And I have often thought that the Republican party had fallen into that state politically as I observed the readiness with which they have deposed their statesmen of integrity and filled their places by their present leaders. Whatever may be the weaknesses of the Democratic party, and they are not immaculate, they have always kept their best men to the front in national and State politics. I may cite as an example for comparison and proof that the three Republican speakers of the House of Representatives since the civil war are Colfax, Blaine and Keiffer; those of the Democratic are Kerr, Randall and Carlisle. We have given the State as Chief Magistrates Seymour, Tilden and Cleveland. All these representative men of talent and experience, are worthy of the party and worthy of the best moral tone of our country.

It cannot be too frequently reiterated that office is a public trust and not a reward for services. That capacity and integrity for the discharge of duties are its sole qualifications, which should never be obscured or disregarded by religious, personal or party prejudice.

All honor, therefore, to the patriotism of the Republicans who have nobly sacrificed party to their instincts for integrity of official life.

While, as a Democrat, I feel proud in the anticipation of the coming success of our constitutional principles, so long suspended under Republican rule, to the great detriment of our national interests, yet I am prouder still as a citizen that our victory will be achieved by the co-operation of an honest and patriotic uprising of the best men of both parties to rebuke corruption and misrule.

We hear a great deal of the Solid South. Why not en-veigh against Solid Republican New England? Yes, the South is solid in desiring the advent of honest and capable officials and constitutional measures of government. To obtain these rights the South must gravitate to the Democratic party, the promoter and advocate of these essentials of good government. It must be admitted they had a sad experience of thieving carpet-baggers at home inflicted on them by the Republican party, and have not yet escaped the corrupt and corrupting effect of the administration of the same party at Washington. The victims of the bloody shirt and of sectional hate desire to be emancipated from the rule of such federal officials as Blaine and his supporters, who fabricate slander and promote sectional hate to draw off public attention from their own corrupt use of official power.

The Solid South, it must not be forgotten, gave us Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, Chief Justice Marshall among the patriots, statesmen, soldiers, and jurists of our early national life, followed by such men as Jackson, Calhoun and Chief Justice Taney as great lights of constitutional government. They were the worthy co-operators with northern patriotism and honest capable statesmanship of Adams, Hancock, Webster, Wright, Van Buren and Seymour, who jointly reflect the glory of our country. But under the decadence of Republican rule, such worthy representatives as Edmunds, Evarts and Conkling and even their own President, Arthur, who has certainly filled the office most creditably, are all set aside by the *machine* politicians, who carp at the Solid South, and substitute the magnetism of Blaine, insulting the suffrage of the *Grand Old Party*, which elected the good and great man, Abraham Lincoln.

Against official dishonesty the South is solid, and it has always been solid. Blaine will find no exception when he hears from the Virginia election, notwithstanding the attempt to corrupt the suffrage by money and the official patronage administered by Senator Mahone. It is true that the South unwisely attempted to vindicate their peculiar institution by civil war instead of relying on the justness of their cause in the Union, and has paid the severe penalty which perhaps unsuccessful civil wars everywhere inflicts. But with all their poverty, in or out of office, in public life, which has reflected honor in their capacity and integrity, before or since the civil war, not a single case of official corruption can be charged against the administration of any Southerner under our government, nor have any of their statesmen been sullied by personal fraud. Long may the South be solid in their integrity and in their love of constitutional government, and in sustaining the national Democratic party which knows no North or no South in the administration of public affairs, but regards fraternal sympathy and equal rights the true basis of the Federal Union.

It is objected that the Solid South influences legislation in greater ratio than their number or wealth ought to give. Perhaps this is true, but it results from a wise and patriotic system of keeping in the public counsels, men of the greatest experience, purity and integrity to represent them—men whose public record is free from personal blemish. Despite their poverty and the unjust discrimination of Republican sectional hatred, they have maintained in public life a class of statesmen and an influence for good government worthy of their ancestry and their Democratic principles. They send us such statesmen as Bayard, Garland, Lamar, Wade Hampton and Carlisle, while under Republican rule, we withdrew from public life such men as Fish, Evarts, Conkling in our own State, and the same policy prevails in most of the other Republican States.

Ask yourselves, you Republicans present, whether the seats of Seward and Conkling in the United States Senate

are worthily filled by the present incumbents ? And is it not now feared that if a Republican legislature be elected in November that the coming vacancy will be filled by some wealthy aspirant whose qualifications will be estimated by the magnitude of his corruption fund to elect him ?

Let us emulate this practice of our Southern brethren and vie with them in electing and keeping in public life Northern Statesmen worthy of our intelligence, and proper representatives of our enterprise and power.

But Republicans plead for a further lease of power when unable to delude the people by false issues and the still more false promises of Blaine's reformation. Indeed, it is quite common for Blaine's friends to admit his moral delinquencies and to intimate that they are simply the effects of a laudable but over aspiration for the Presidency which, when accomplished, will produce reform. Even hinting that he purposes to cut loose from his corrupt associates, and even to leave his friends Dorsey, Elkins, Ben Butler, Mahone, Jay Gould and the Rev. Dr. Ball out in the cold.

But, gentlemen, I have heard of reformed rakes and reformed drunkards becoming virtuous husbands and sober citizens, yet a long probation is a safe practice, and an experienced business man would never entrust his money to an unfaithful cashier.

We have an example of great force in the Scriptures which fits the case : Where an unclean spirit had gone out of a man, the divine writer informs us, and he found his house swept and garnished (an operation sadly needed by Blaine), we are informed that he took unto himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and the last state of that man was worse than the first.

A feeble attempt has been made to justify, if not to endorse, the public record of Blaine by leading Republicans of respectability. And while Mr. Phelps of New Jersey, comes to the front in that capacity with arguments which only induced farther damaging investigation, and deepens conviction in the public mind. Senator Edmunds was drawn into the defense, but his opinion of

Blaine's official integrity reminds me of a conscientious, but friendly witness in a New England trial of a man charged with stealing poultry. It was quite apparent that the witness desired to screen the culprit, who was his neighbor, and, yet, like Edmunds, would not be guilty of an untruth. He gave the prisoner a cautious, but fair general character. The counsel for the defense wishing to clinch the good character of his client before the jury, asked the witness if he believed the prisoner would rob a hen-roost, to which he replied with Edmund's caution: "That he was not ready to say that the prisoner would or would not commit such a crime, but that if he (the witness) was a pullet and the prisoner a fox prowling in the neighborhood, he would certainly roost very high."

All honor to that class of Republicans who have patriotically discharged their public duties as statesmen, soldiers and citizens during the civil war, and who have resisted the corrupting influence of government patronage during their long tenure of political power. I feel proud of their association with us in this contest to save from official corruption that Union they did so much to preserve. But there is a great deal of nonsense about the claims of the "Grand Old Party" to the sole credit of a restored Union, and the reduction of our national debt.

The facts are the Union was saved by the *Boys in Blue* of both parties, an army organized by McClellan, a Democratic General, and lead to victory by Grant, a Republican General. Not saved by such peace warriors as Blaine, who, according to the *Chicago Tribune* (already quoted) sent a substitute into the Union army, while he was engaged more safely and profitably in soliciting government contracts in Washington, and after the peace, as a member of Congress, this Plumed Knight of the bloody shirt was valient in abuse of our disarmed Southern brethren, who had surrendered to brave men on the field of battle, and by brave men treated generously in their adversity. Whatever has been done in the way of the reduction of our public debt by the Republican administration, is due to the heavy tax levied on the labor of the fields of the

farmer, and borne by the productions of the artisan, which, if administered honestly and economically ought to have ere this extinguished the whole war debt.

It was not the care or the skill of such financiers as Jay Cooke & Co., the bankrupt government bankers, nor the extravagant donations by a Republican Congress of millions of acres of our public lands and millions of dollars raised by taxation and simply given to speculative railway schemes. It was not this exercises of Republican extravagance which garnered the public resources. It is, however, suggestive that leading Republican statesmen entering public employment nearly pennyless, should now blossom out as millionaires. The stock in trade of these adventurers remaining at home like Blaine, during the war was their blatant *loyalty*, and the abuse of men they dare not fight. "The loyal" were those in pursuit of government contracts or of office—the "*truly loyal*" were those that obtained them.

Blaine in this sense was the "truly loyal," his rapid accumulations and great wealth justifies the title. Himself and the "*Grand old party*," who have enriched and now sustain him and themselves by public plunder, will be, I trust, things of the past after the November election, and the industry and legitimate enterprises of our country will profit by their defeat. Sound principles of political economy are essentials to good government—Without them the most honest and zealous efforts will fail, but when we blend sectional and party prejudice with official corruption, it is easy to forecast the fate of such an administration.

The Republicans have maintained power many years in violation of every principle of jurisprudence and the well-settled axioms of political economy, and we are now suffering the consequences of their ignorance and misrule—They have sown to the wind and we are now reaping the whirlwind—of commercial and industrial disaster.

The coming elections will, I trust, relieve us at least of their official dishonesty and legislative extravagance.

We want in future, capacity and integrity in our rulers—not party zeal—nor sectional prejudice—nor the imputed magnetism of Blaine. But we must have the sound Democratic principles—the official integrity and the broad national sympathy of Grover Cleveland to cement our Union—conserve the interest and protect the rights of every industry and of every class of our citizens.

